

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner very much for the constructive assistance and suggestions he offers to provide pursuant to M.P.E.P. §707.07 (j) in the Office Action mailed 1999, July 28. The Examiner can counts upon full cooperation from applicant in order to place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible.

OA issues #3 and #5

Applicant is quite amenable to the changes the Examiner proposed in the independent claims 1, 2 and 16 and has rewritten these claims accordingly except on a small but important point. Applicant would like to keep claimed the possibility of having only one out of the two arms provided with an elastic buffer as it was specified in the original description, page 5, line 18, page 6, line 13, page 20, lines 3-4, page 21, line 5, page 23, lines 25-26, and accordingly shown in Fig. 1.

This can be still found page 2, line 38, page 3, lines 22-23, page 9, lines 4-5 and line 39, page 11, line 9 in the substitute specification filed 09/05/95 and still shown in Fig.1. That covers in particular the case where one of the arms is a worktable with a tranverse hole in which the support part is disposed. The support part carries another arm to which is secured an elastic buffer or the worktable is covered with a springy material. Of course, the benefits brought by the elastic buffer are only exerted on the side of the arm which is equipped therewith. That is fine when only one side of the object to be clamped is delicate and its other side is flat and hard or the like.

The Examiner is requested with deference to review, in the above draft amendment to independent claims 1, 2 and 16, made according to his suggestions, the alteration made by applicant and to inform applicant of desirable improvements if any. Upon receiving the Examiner's comments about this point, definitive version of said claims will be submitted and work for amending the remainder of the claims to put them in condition of allowance could begin. It is believed that wording adopted to amend these claims should be helpful to correct errors in the specification.

OA issue #1

Subject matter of claims 12-15 is disclosed page 14, lines 13-38 in the substitute specification filed 09/05/95 and from page 29, line 10 to page 30, line 7 in the original specification. Drawing(s) showing the subject matter of these claims will be added to existing drawings.

OA issue #6

Each of the references (Posch, Foerster or Foerster) cited in the OA as a prior art made of record discloses clamping jaws which contact difficult shapes only on a limited number of separated and parallel line segments. Therefore the clamping force is concentrated upon a limited number of quasinull-area surfaces,

that is to say globally upon a tiny area. As by definition the pressure equals the ratio of the clamping force to the covered area, that gives a very high pressure located to the line segments, that is to say pressure peaks along these segments. That confirms that the invention as defined by claims 1-3 and 11-16 provides a new and unexpected result in avoiding any pressure peak when difficult-shaped surfaces are clamped (see from page 5, line 18 to page 6, line 22 in paper submitted by applicant on 03/29/99).

On the other hand, each of these references utilizes, of course, a means such as a lever associated with a screw to greatly amplify the hand strength for getting the clamping force or a lever associated with a spring to replace the hand strength by a substitute to make the clamping force. That gives the hand a loose perception or no perception at all of the gradualness of the clamping. As a result, there is no precise tactile perception of the gradualness of the clamping which the invention as defined by claims 1-3 and 11-16 provides as a new and unexpected result (see from page 4, line 15 to page 5, line 17 in paper submitted by applicant on 03/29/99).

But if the object of these references of the twenties of this century was to conform to difficult shapes, the fact that they succeeded only to contact articles in a discrete way is an additional evidence that the invention as defined by claims 1-3 and 11-16 solves a long-felt, long-existing but unsolved need.

Conclusion and Further Request for Constructive Assistance

By this draft first response to the Office Action mailed 1999, July 28, applicant hopes to have submitted the elements the Examiner was looking for to provide applicant further constructive assistance pursuant to M.P.E.P. §707.07 (j).

Very Respectfully

Philippe BERNA

Philippe Berna, Applicant Pro Se

Mailing address: Mas Liotard - Les Brousses, F30410 Molières-sur-Cèze, France (Phone: (33) 490 85 90 81, Fax: (33) 490 85 90 81)

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper of two pages including this one has been facsimile transmitted to the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Office on the date shown below.

Philippe Berna

Philippe BERNA
Signature

09/09/99
Date